

REMARKS

In the Office Action of October 20, 2004, Claims 1 - 9, 16 - 20, 23, 24 and 30 - 35 were rejected. Claims 12 - 15, 21 and 22 were objected to, and Claims 25 - 28 were allowed. In response, Claims 1 - 9, 16 - 20, 23, 24 and 29 - 35 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claims 10, 13, 21 and 22 are amended. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Objection to Claim 1

The Examiner objected to Claim 1 because of an informality. In particular, the Examiner alleged that "the stable particle dispersion state" should be changed to --a stable particle dispersion state--. This correction is made in Claims 10 and 13, which are rewritten as independent claims incorporating the limitations of now-canceled Claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 1 - 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Kaufman

Rejection of Claims 5 - 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaufman

Rejection of Claims 16 - 24 [except for Claims 21 and 22, which the Examiner indicates would be allowable if rewritten as independent claims] under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaufman

Rejection of Claims 26 [this should probably be Claim 29], 34 and 35 under 35

U.S.C. §102(b) over Kaufman

Rejection of Claims 30 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaufman

Claims 1 - 9, 16 - 20, 23, 24 and 30 - 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§102(b) or 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaufman (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,997). These rejections are moot because of the cancellation herein of Claims 1 - 9, 16 - 20, 23, 24 and 29 - 35 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Objection to Claims 10 - 12, 13 - 15, and 21 - 22

Claims 10 - 12, 13 - 15 and 21 - 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, Claims 10, 13, 21 and 22 are amended as independent claims including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 10 - 12, 13 - 15 and 21 - 22 are now allowable.

Comment on Examiner's Statement of Reason for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter Regarding Claims 25 - 28

The Examiner states that Claims 25 - 28 are considered allowable because the art of record does not teach or suggest the steps of (a) forming a groove in an element-isolating region of the primary surface of a wafer by etching the element-isolating region of the primary surface of said wafer using an oxidation-resistant insulating film formed over the primary surface of the wafer as a mask and (b) forming a silicone oxide insulating film over the primary surface of the wafer including the inside of the groove. Applicants would like to state for the record that novelty lies in the subsequent steps of (c) diluting the polishing slurry containing 11 - 15 weight % of silica with deionized water and (d) supplying the polishing slurry on the primary surface of the wafer for which step (b) has been finished, immediately after being diluted with the water solution and chemically-mechanically polishing the

silicone oxide insulating film using the oxidation-resistant insulating film as a stopper to selectively leave the silicone insulating film inside the groove, forming the insulating, isolating film smoothed by polishing in the element isolating region.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 10 - 15, 21, 22 and 25 - 28 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Kindly charge any additional fees due, or credit overpayment of fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (501.41263X00).

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS



Ralph T. Webb
Reg. No. 33,047

RTW/RTW
(703)312-6600